arXiv:1610.06911v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 21 Oct 2016

From interacting particles to equilibrium statistical ensembles

Enej Ilievski,[1] Eoin Quinn,[1] and Jean-Sébastien Caux[1]

[1] *Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Amsterdam, Science Park 904, 1098 XH Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

(Dated: October 24, 2016)

We demonstrate that a complete description of equilibrium ensembles for interacting integrable models requires a formulation built from the mode occupation numbers of the underlying particle content. This provides a direct physical picture of the generalized Gibbs ensemble, and naturally connects to the non-interacting case. We explain how previous attempts to define an appropriate ensemble overlooked an essential piece of information, and exemplify this with explicit examples in the context of quantum quenches.

PACS numbers: 02.30.Ik,05.70.Ln,75.10.Jm

The last decade has seen experimental techniques in optical lattices establish themselves as a fruitful playground for testing paradigms of quantum statistical physics [1–4]. A hallmark achievement has been the observation of anomalous equilibration in ultracold bosonic condensates [5–9], which sparked a great amount of theoretical research in this direction [10–24]. The non-ergodic character of quantum dynamics in these systems is attributed to the fact that they lie in the vicinity of an integrable point. It became clear that a new framework would be required to properly characterize their relaxation process. An important first step towards this goal is a complete description of equilibration for quantum integrable models.

To this end the concept of a generalized Gibbs ensemble (GGE) has been proposed, conventionally given in the form [25–27],

$$\hat{\varrho} = \exp\Big[-\sum_i \lambda_i \hat{Q}_i\Big], \tag{1}$$

where $\hat{Q}_i$ is some appropriately chosen set of conserved operators, and λ_i the associated Lagrange multipliers. The notion of a GGE rests on the 'principle of locality', which states that the properties of local observables are completely characterized by including all local conserved charges $\hat{Q}_i$. This provides a greatly simplified description compared to the diagonal ensemble, which retains the entire information about the initial condition.

Initial investigations focused on non-interacting particles, for which the conserved operators forming the GGE are the single-particle mode numbers [28–33]. Formulating the GGE for genuinely interacting models turned out to be more elusive however [34–40], due to the less obvious structure of the local conservation laws. Indeed, the first exact determination of equilibrium states in interacting models came from an alternative route, the Quench Action method [41–44].

A central question has been the identification and physical interpretation of the charges $\hat{Q}_i$. All proposals to date have attempted to define the GGE in terms of the Hamiltonian and other local charges obtained from the traditional algebraic Bethe Ansatz procedure [45, 46]. These suffer from two major drawbacks however. Firstly, they shed no light on the physical content of the charges. More importantly though, they omit a crucial part of the local information necessary to characterize general equilibrium states, as we will later demonstrate with explicit examples. In this Letter we advocate a shift of perspective which overcomes both these difficulties.

The distinguishing feature of interacting integrable models is the factorized scattering of excitations, which allows their entire spectrum to be characterized in terms of stable particles [47]. We propose that the number operators of these particles provide the most natural complete set for the local conserved $\hat{Q}_i$ in Eq. (1). Not only does this demystify the nature of the charges, but it also captures the part of the manifold of equilibrium ensembles missed by previous proposals. Specifically, expressing the ensemble in terms of particle density operators $\hat{\rho}_j(v)$ it takes the from

$$\hat{\varrho} = \exp\Big[-\sum_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}v\, \mu_j(v)\hat{\rho}_j(v)\Big], \tag{2}$$

where the index j runs over distinct particle types, v is a rapidity variable which parametrizes their momenta $p_j(v)$, and $\mu_j(v)$ are rapidity dependent chemical potentials.

We focus on the prototypical integrable model, the Heisenberg spin-1/2 chain, $\hat{H} \simeq -\sum_i \vec{S}_i \cdot \vec{S}_{i+1}$. The particle content, with respect to a fully polarized state, consists of magnons and j-particle bound states thereof, with momenta $p_j(v) = -\mathrm{i}\log\big((v+j\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2})/(v-j\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2})\big)$ [48]. In the thermodynamic limit states are described in terms of a set of density distributions ρ_j, which are formally the eigenvalue densities of the operators $\hat{\rho}_j$. We shall refer to a set of densities ρ_j as a *macrostate*. Individual microstates drawn from the same macrostate differ only by rearrangements of the occupation of the $L\rho_j(v)\mathrm{d}v$ quantum numbers in a rapidity window $\mathrm{d}v$, and thus have a negligible effect on the local correlations in the thermodynamic limit.

Recently a complete set of local charges $\hat{X}_j(v)$ for the Heisenberg model has been identified [49], which allows macrostates to be uniquely determined from of the values of charge densities X_j via string-charge duality [50]. This takes the form of a discrete wave equation

$$\rho_j = \Box X_j, \tag{3}$$

where $\Box$ is a d'Alembertian on $X_j(v)$ defined for a set of functions $f_j(v)$ as

$$\Box f_j = f_j^+ + f_j^- - f_{j-1} - f_{j+1}, \tag{4}$$

where $f_j^\pm(v) = f_j(v \pm \frac{\mathrm{i}}{2} \mp \mathrm{i}0^+)$ and 0^+ denotes an infinitesimal which acts as a regulator.

Previous attempts at identifying a complete ensemble were built directly from the charges. In particular, the most recent proposed GGE used the full set $\hat{X}_j(v)$, conveniently cast in the form [23, 51]

$$\hat{\varrho} = \exp\Big[-\sum_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}v\ \lambda_j(v)\hat{X}_j(v) - B\hat{S}^z\Big], \tag{5}$$

where $\lambda_j(v)$ are Lagrange multipliers and B couples to the magnetization $\hat{S}^z$. While this appears natural, due to the correspondence between ρ_j and X_j in Eq. (3), it however fails to capture generic equilibrium states. In the following we provide a careful examination of the structure of equilibrium states, highlight the origin of this incompleteness, and provide explicit examples in the context of a quantum quench scenario.

TECHNICAL BACKGROUND

Integrability of the model is ensured by the existence of a commuting family of operators $\hat{T}_j$, known as transfer matrices (defined in Supplementary Material). Following refs. [49–51], a set of conserved charges is naturally identified,

$$\hat{X}_j(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi\mathrm{i}}\partial_v \log \hat{T}_j(v + \tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}). \tag{6}$$

These are Hermitian for $u \in \mathbb{R}$, and local for $u \in \mathcal{P}$, where

$$\mathcal{P} = \{v \in \mathbb{C} : |\mathrm{Im}(v)| < \tfrac{1}{2}\}, \tag{7}$$

represents a domain in the complex plane known as the 'physical strip'. We remark that in the sense of ref. [49] the charges $\hat{X}_j$ are no longer local [52] on the boundary of $\mathcal{P}$. The locality of the particle density operators $\hat{\rho}_j(v)$ crucially depends on appearance of the regulator in the definition of $\Box$, Eq. (4).

The eigenvalue densities X_j of the charges $\hat{X}_j$ are expressed in terms of the particle densities compactly as

$$X_j = G_{j,k} \star \rho_k, \quad G_{j,k} = \sum_{m=1}^{j} a_{|j-k|-1+2m}, \tag{8}$$

where the kernel $a_j(v) = -\frac{1}{2\pi}\partial_v p_j(v)$, $(f \star g)(v) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}t\, f(v-t)g(t)$ denotes convolution, and repeated indices are summed over. The matrix kernel G represents the Green's function of the the discrete d'Alembertian $\Box$, $(\Box G_{j,k})(v) = \delta_{j,k}\delta(v)$. This allows the relationship between X_j and ρ_j to be readily inverted, which yields Eq. (3).

The thermodynamics of integrable models is conveniently treated in the language of Thermodynamic Bethe Ansatz (TBA) [48, 53–56]. We shall proceed with minimal technicality, and refer the reader to the Supplementary Material and references therein. The partition function $\mathcal{Z} = \mathrm{Tr}\,\hat{\varrho}$ is cast as a functional integration over the set of densities ρ_j,

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int \mathcal{D}[\rho_j] \exp\Big[-L \sum_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}v \Big(\mu_j(v)\rho_j(v) + \mathfrak{s}_j(v)\Big)\Big],$$

where the combinatorial weight is given by the Yang–Yang entropy density per mode [53],

$$\mathfrak{s}_j(v) = \rho_j \log\Big(1 + \frac{\bar{\rho}_j}{\rho_j}\Big) + \bar{\rho}_j \log\Big(1 + \frac{\rho_j}{\bar{\rho}_j}\Big). \tag{9}$$

The functions $\bar{\rho}_j$ represent the densities of unoccupied modes, which obey the Bethe–Yang equations [48, 53]

$$\rho_j + \bar{\rho}_j = a_j - a_{j,k} \star \rho_k, \tag{10}$$

where the integral kernels $a_{j,k}$ are given by $a_{j,k} = G_{j,k-1} + G_{j,k+1}$. The saddle-point evaluation of $\mathcal{Z}$ yields a set of coupled non-linear integral equations known as the TBA equations [57, 58],

$$\log Y_j = \mu_j + a_{j,k} \star \log(1 + Y_k^{-1}), \tag{11}$$

written in terms of Y-functions $Y_j = \bar{\rho}_j/\rho_j$. Together equations (10) and (11) completely determine the equilibrium state. They provide the direct relationship between the set of chemical potentials μ_j and the set of macrostates ρ_j, demonstrating the completeness of the ensemble given in Eq. (2).

For practical purposes, it is useful to switch to an alternative formulation of the TBA equations. The infinite sum in Eq. (11) can be eliminated with the use of kernel identities, yielding a local form

$$\log Y_j = d_j + s \star \log\big[(1 + Y_{j-1})(1 + Y_{j+1})\big], \tag{12}$$

where the source terms are $d_j = \mu_j - s \star (\mu_{j-1} + \mu_{j+1})$, and the convolution kernel $s(v) = (2\cosh(\pi v))^{-1}$. These are equivalent to Eq. (11) when supplemented with the large-v asymptotics of the Y-functions. To proceed, care must be taken when inverting the convolution with s, as the *pseudo-inverse* defined through

$$s^{-1} \star f = f^+ + f^-, \tag{13}$$

has a non-trivial null space, see e.g. [59, 60]. In particular, while $s^{-1} \star (s \star f) = f$ for any function f, in general

$s \star (s^{-1} \star f) \neq f$. We thus decompose the source terms as

$$d_j = s \star \lambda_j + d_j^{\emptyset}, \tag{14}$$

where $\lambda_j = s^{-1} \star d_j$, and the 'singular components' $d_j^{\emptyset}$ are annihilated by s^{-1}. Applying s^{-1} to Eq. (12) and exponentiating, yields the modified Y-system relations

$$Y_j^+ Y_j^- = e^{\lambda_j}(1 + Y_{j-1})(1 + Y_{j+1}). \tag{15}$$

In the process the singular components are not lost, but are instead encoded in the analytic data of the Y-functions: their poles and zeros in the physical strip $\mathcal{P}$. Equation (12) is reobtained by convolving the logarithm of Eq. (15) with s, after multiplying out the singularities ξ with the functions [60, 61]

$$t(v;\xi) = \tanh\left(\tfrac{\pi}{2}(v-\xi)\right), \quad |\mathrm{Im}(\xi)| < \tfrac{1}{2}, \tag{16}$$

which satisfy $t^+ t^- = 1$. As a result the singular components are of the form

$$d_j^{\emptyset}(v) = \sum_a \log t(v;\xi_a^{j,\mathrm{z}}) - \sum_b \log t(v;\xi_b^{j,\mathrm{p}}), \tag{17}$$

where $\{\xi_a^{j,\mathrm{z}}\}$ and $\{\xi_b^{j,\mathrm{p}}\}$ are respectively the sets of zeros and poles of the Y-function Y_j in $\mathcal{P}$.

We now address the question of the generality of the charge-based GGE of Eq. (5). Using Eq. (8), this ensemble takes the form of Eq. (2) with $\mu_j = G_{j,k} \star \lambda_k + Bj$. Naïvely the two ensembles could then be assumed equivalent. The crucial point however is that the Lagrange multipliers λ_j are blind to the singular components $d_j^{\emptyset}$. In fact, as $\Box\mu_j = \lambda_j$, the Lagrange multipliers precisely match the functions λ_j introduced in the decomposition of Eq. (14).

Put another way, the d'Alembertian $\Box$ inherits a null space from s^{-1}, and $\Box\mu_j = \lambda_j$ demonstrates that the Lagrange multipliers λ_j of Eq. (5) cannot encode the components of μ_j in this null space. In the following section we provide evidence that singular component contributions are a generic feature of equilibrium states. To conclude, it is worthwhile to stress that the null space of $\Box$ does not cause a problem for the string-charge duality relations, Eqs. (3) and (8), as the densities ρ_j on which $\Box$ acts already encode the full information about an eigenstate.

EXAMPLES

We now explicitly demonstrate this limitation of the charge-based GGE of Eq. (5) with some examples in the context a quantum quench. Starting from an initial state $|\Psi\rangle$, the equilibrium macrostate ρ_j reached in the long-time limit is determined, via $\rho_j = \Box X_j$, from the expectation values of charge densities

$$X_j(v) = \lim_{L\to\infty} L^{-1} \langle\Psi| \hat{X}_j(v) |\Psi\rangle . \tag{18}$$

As described above, it is convenient to encode a macrostate in the Y-functions, $Y_j = \bar{\rho}_j/\rho_j$. The condition that the charge-based GGE is a valid ensemble is the absence of poles and zeros of these functions in the physical strip $\mathcal{P}$, defined in Eq. (7).

The best studied quenches are those from (i) the 'dimer' state $|\mathrm{D}\rangle = \frac{1}{2^{L/2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle)^{\otimes L/2}$, and (ii) the Néel state $|\mathrm{N}\rangle = |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle^{\otimes L/2}$, for which the Y-functions are explicitly known [62, 63]. For the dimer quench these are [50]

$$Y_j(v) = \frac{j(j+2)v^2}{(v + (j+1)\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2})(v - (j+1)\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2})}. \tag{19}$$

The double zero at the origin immediately indicates that the Lagrange multipliers λ_j in the charge-based GGE are not sufficient to capture it. Indeed, the source terms $d_j(v) = \log\tanh(\frac{\pi}{2}v)^2$, determined through Eq. (12), are in the null space of s^{-1}, from which it follows that λ_j=0! We stress that the state is by no means close to the infinite-temperature Gibbs state in terms of local correlation functions. Previous works mistakenly computed non-trivial λ_j for this state [51, 62, 63], resulting in the incorrect interpretation of the GGE. The important point is that due to the non-trivial null space of s^{-1} it is *not* permissible to define λ_j via Fourier transform, namely $\mathcal{F}[\lambda_j] \neq \mathcal{F}[d_j]/\mathcal{F}[s]$.

The Néel state is similar. Again the source terms $d_j(v) = (-1)^{j+1}\log\tanh(\frac{\pi}{2}v)^2$ consist solely of singular components, indicating $\lambda_j = 0$ for this state also. Indeed, these two examples are members of a particular class of initial states, whose equilibrium states can be cast as the partition function of a vertex model for which the initial state provides an *integrable* boundary [64]. Generic initial states do not admit such a description.

We thus also consider more general product states. A complete analytic treatment is now out of scope, as the complexity of the charge densities X_j, computed via Eq. (18), grow quickly with j. Nevertheless, the lowest Y-functions are straightforwardly determined. A particular example is the state composed of alternating 2-site domain walls, $|\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle^{\otimes L/4}$. Explicit expressions are unwieldy, see Supplementary Material. They indicate non-trivial λ_j, and that Y_1 has four zeros at $\pm(0.382 \pm 0.234\,\mathrm{i})$ and two poles at $\pm 0.155\,\mathrm{i}$. This analytic data indicates that again the resulting equilibrium state is not captured by the GGE of Eq. (5).

CONCLUSION

We have shown that a complete description of equilibrium states in interacting integrable models requires the ensemble to be constructed from the number operators of the model's particle content. Any attempt to reduce the description inevitably leads to a loss of information, rendering a part of the equilibrium manifold inaccessible. The proposal naturally extends the established framework for non-interacting particles to the interacting integrable regime. The effect of non-trivial scattering in the interacting case is that excitations about an equilibrium state get non-trivially dressed by the correlations of the state, see e.g. [53, 65].

Alternatively one can consider the microcanonical ensemble, namely an unbiased collection of eigenstates which share the same set of quantum numbers. For thermodynamically large systems this exactly matches the canonical description, with the density operators of the particles providing a labelling of the microcanonical shells. Distinct microstates drawn from the same macrostate are indistinguishable on the level of local observables, and the entropy is given explicitly by Eq. (9). This can be viewed as the analogue of the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis [66–69] used to characterize the thermalization of eigenstates in ergodic interacting systems.

The singular components $d_j^{\emptyset}$ play a vital role in our analysis of the incompleteness of the charge-based GGE of Eq. (5). While formally these encode the analytic structure of Y-functions, it would be interesting to find a physical interpretation.

Our hope is that the particle-based perspective which we advocate here creates a platform for the study of equilibration as one leaves the integrable points. The resulting loss of factorized scattering induces timescales up to which the particle-based description of ensembles may be expected to accurately capture statistical properties of quasi-stationary states, the so-called pre-thermalized regime [70–73].

Acknowledgements. E. I. thanks L. Vidmar for sharing some insightful remarks, and acknowledges support by VENI grant by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). The work of E. Q. and J-S. C. is part of the research programme of the Foundation for Fundamental Research on Matter (FOM), which is part of NWO. The work forms part of the activities of the Delta-Institute for Theoretical Physics (D-ITP).

[1] M. Greiner, O. Mandel, T. Esslinger, T. W. Hänsch, and I. Bloch, Nature **415**, 39 (2002).
[2] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, Reviews of Modern Physics **80**, 885 (2008).
[3] A. Polkovnikov, K. Sengupta, A. Silva, and M. Vengalattore, Reviews of Modern Physics **83**, 863 (2011).
[4] T. Langen, T. Gasenzer, and J. Schmiedmayer, J. Stat. Mech. **2016**, 064009 (2016).
[5] T. Kinoshita, T. Wenger, and D. S. Weiss, Nature **440**, 900 (2006).
[6] S. Trotzky, Y.-A. Chen, A. Flesch, I. P. McCulloch, U. Schollwöck, J. Eisert, and I. Bloch, Nature Physics **8**, 325 (2012).
[7] M. Gring, M. Kuhnert, T. Langen, T. Kitagawa, B. Rauer, M. Schreitl, I. Mazets, D. A. Smith, E. Demler, and J. Schmiedmayer, Science **337**, 1318 (2012).
[8] M. Cheneau, P. Barmettler, D. Poletti, M. Endres, P. Schauß, T. Fukuhara, C. Gross, I. Bloch, C. Kollath, and S. Kuhr, Nature **481**, 484 (2012).
[9] T. Langen, S. Erne, R. Geiger, B. Rauer, T. Schweigler, M. Kuhnert, W. Rohringer, I. E. Mazets, T. Gasenzer, and J. Schmiedmayer, Science **348**, 207 (2015).
[10] C. Kollath, A. M. Läuchli, and E. Altman, Physical Review Letters **98**, 180601 (2007).
[11] S. R. Manmana, S. Wessel, R. M. Noack, and A. Muramatsu, Physical Review Letters **98**, 210405 (2007).
[12] M. Moeckel and S. Kehrein, Physical Review Letters **100**, 175702 (2008).
[13] A. Iucci and M. A. Cazalilla, Phys. Rev. A **80** (2009), 10.1103/physreva.80.063619.
[14] J.-S. Caux and R. M. Konik, Physical Review Letters **109**, 175301 (2012).
[15] J. Eisert, M. Friesdorf, and C. Gogolin, Nature Physics **11**, 124 (2015).
[16] J. D. Nardis, L. Piroli, and J.-S. Caux, J. Phys. A **48**, 43FT01 (2015).
[17] F. Essler, G. Mussardo, and M. Panfil, Physical Review A **91**, 051602 (2015).
[18] D. Bernard and B. Doyon, J. Stat. Mech. **2016**, 064005 (2016).
[19] P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. Stat. Mech. **2016**, 064003 (2016).
[20] M. A. Cazalilla and M.-C. Chung, J. Stat. Mech. **2016**, 064004 (2016).
[21] A. D. Luca and G. Mussardo, J. Stat. Mech. **2016**, 064011 (2016).
[22] F. H. L. Essler and M. Fagotti, J. Stat. Mech. **2016**, 064002 (2016).
[23] E. Ilievski, M. Medenjak, T. Prosen, and L. Zadnik, J. Stat. Mech. **2016**, 064008 (2016).
[24] L. Vidmar and M. Rigol, J. Stat. Mech. **2016**, 064007 (2016).
[25] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, V. Yurovsky, and M. Olshanii, Physical Review Letters **98**, 050405 (2007).
[26] M. A. Cazalilla, Physical Review Letters **97**, 156403 (2006).
[27] A. C. Cassidy, C. W. Clark, and M. Rigol, Physical Review Letters **106**, 140405 (2011).
[28] P. Calabrese, F. H. Essler, and M. Fagotti, Physical Review Letters **106**, 227203 (2011).
[29] P. Calabrese, F. H. Essler, and M. Fagotti, J. Stat. Mech. **2012**, P07016 (2012).
[30] P. Calabrese, F. H. Essler, and M. Fagotti, J. Stat. Mech. **2012**, P07022 (2012).
[31] F. H. Essler, S. Evangelisti, and M. Fagotti, Physical Review Letters **109**, 247206 (2012).
[32] M. Fagotti and F. H. Essler, Physical Review B **87**, 245107 (2013).

[33] S. Sotiriadis and P. Calabrese, J. Stat. Mech.: Th. Exp. **2014**, P07024 (2014).
[34] D. Fioretto and G. Mussardo, New J. Phys. **12**, 055015 (2010).
[35] M. Kormos, A. Shashi, Y.-Z. Chou, J.-S. Caux, and A. Imambekov, Physical Review B **88**, 205131 (2013).
[36] M. Kormos, M. Collura, and P. Calabrese, Physical Review A **89**, 013609 (2014).
[37] M. Fagotti and F. H. Essler, J. Stat. Mech. **2013**, P07012 (2013).
[38] B. Bertini, D. Schuricht, and F. H. L. Essler, J. Stat. Mech. **2014**, P10035 (2014).
[39] M. Fagotti, M. Collura, F. H. Essler, and P. Calabrese, Physical Review B **89**, 125101 (2014).
[40] G. Goldstein and N. Andrei, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 043625 (2014).
[41] J.-S. Caux and F. H. Essler, Physical Review Letters **110**, 257203 (2013).
[42] J. De Nardis, B. Wouters, M. Brockmann, and J.-S. Caux, Physical Review A **89**, 033601 (2014).
[43] B. Wouters, J. De Nardis, M. Brockmann, D. Fioretto, M. Rigol, and J.-S. Caux, Physical Review Letters **113**, 117202 (2014).
[44] B. Pozsgay, M. Mestyán, M. Werner, M. Kormos, G. Zaránd, and G. Takács, Physical Review Letters **113**, 117203 (2014).
[45] L. Faddeev, arXiv preprint hep-th/9605187 (1996).
[46] V. E. Korepin, N. M. Bogoliubov, and A. G. Izergin, *Quantum Inverse Scattering Method and Correlation Functions* (Cambridge University Press (CUP), 1993).
[47] A. B. Zamolodchikov and A. B. Zamolodchikov, Annals of physics **120**, 253 (1979).
[48] M. Takahashi, Progress of Theoretical Physics **46**, 401 (1971).
[49] E. Ilievski, M. Medenjak, and T. Prosen, Physical Review Letters **115**, 120601 (2015).
[50] E. Ilievski, E. Quinn, J. De Nardis, and M. Brockmann, J. Stat. Mech. **2016**, 063101 (2016).
[51] E. Ilievski, J. De Nardis, B. Wouters, J.-S. Caux, F. H. Essler, and T. Prosen, Physical Review Letters **115**, 157201 (2015).
[52] We do not distinguish between locality and quasi-locality [23].
[53] C.-N. Yang and C. Yang, Journal of Mathematical Physics **10**, 1115 (1969).
[54] M. Gaudin, Physical Review Letters **26**, 1301 (1971).
[55] M. Takahashi and M. Suzuki, Progress of theoretical physics **48**, 2187 (1972).
[56] F. H. L. Essler, H. Frahm, F. Ghmann, A. Klmper, and V. E. Korepin, *The One-Dimensional Hubbard Model* (Cambridge University Press (CUP), 2005).
[57] A. B. Zamolodchikov, Nuclear Physics B **342**, 695 (1990).
[58] A. B. Zamolodchikov, Physics Letters B **253**, 391 (1991).
[59] G. Arutyunov and S. Frolov, Journal of High Energy Physics **2009**, 019 (2009).
[60] S. J. Van Tongeren, J. Phys. A **47**, 433001 (2014).
[61] J. Balog and Á. Hegedűs, Journal of High Energy Physics **2011**, 1 (2011).
[62] M. Brockmann, B. Wouters, D. Fioretto, J. De Nardis, R. Vlijm, and J.-S. Caux, J. Stat. Mech. **2014**, P12009 (2014).
[63] M. Mestyán, B. Pozsgay, G. Takács, and M. Werner, J. Stat. Mech. **2015**, P04001 (2015).
[64] B. Pozsgay, J. Stat. Mech. **2013**, P10028 (2013).
[65] E. Quinn and S. Frolov, J. Phys. A **46**, 205001 (2013).
[66] J. Deutsch, Physical Review A **43**, 2046 (1991).
[67] M. Srednicki, Physical Review E **50**, 888 (1994).
[68] M. Rigol, V. Dunjko, and M. Olshanii, Nature **452**, 854 (2008).
[69] L. D'Alessio, Y. Kafri, A. Polkovnikov, and M. Rigol, Advances in Physics **65**, 239 (2016).
[70] M. Kollar, F. A. Wolf, and M. Eckstein, Physical Review B **84**, 054304 (2011).
[71] M. Marcuzzi, J. Marino, A. Gambassi, and A. Silva, Physical review letters **111**, 197203 (2013).
[72] B. Bertini, F. H. Essler, S. Groha, and N. J. Robinson, Physical review letters **115**, 180601 (2015).
[73] B. Bertini and M. Fagotti, J. Stat. Mech. **2015**, P07012 (2015).
[74] J.-S. Caux, J. Stat. Mech. **2016**, 064006 (2016).
[75] A. Kuniba and T. Nakanishi, Modern Physics Letters A **7**, 3487 (1992).
[76] A. Kuniba, T. Nakanishi, and J. Suzuki, International Journal of Modern Physics A **9**, 5215 (1994).
[77] L. Piroli, E. Vernier, and P. Calabrese, Physical Review B **94** (2016), 10.1103/physrevb.94.054313.

Supplementary Material: From interacting particles to equilibrium statistical ensembles

In this Supplementary Material is to give the essential technical background of the Bethe Ansatz framework. Special attention is devoted to the derivation of the TBA equations, along with the corresponding functional relations and physical interpretation of its analytic input. We provide explicit solutions of two widely studies examples of quantum quenches, the antiferromagnetic Néel state and the 'dimer state', and outline how to treat generic states. We conclude by making a connection to the Quench Action approach [41, 74].

STRING HYPOTHESIS AND BETHE–YANG EQUATIONS

Any eigenstate of the isotropic Heisenberg spin chain of finite length L is associated a unique set of M rapidities. These are obtained from solutions to Bethe quantization conditions,

$$e^{\mathrm{i}p(v)L}\prod_{k=1}^{M}S_{1,1}(v-v_k)=-1,\qquad v=v_1,v_2,\ldots,v_M, \tag{S1}$$

where M/L is the magnetization density, $p(v)=-\mathrm{i}\log\big((u+\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2})/(u-\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2})\big)$, and the scattering amplitude $S_{1,1}$ is a member of a complete set of scattering amplitudes

$$S_j(v)=\frac{v-j\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}}{v+j\frac{\mathrm{i}}{2}},\quad S_{j,k}=S_{|j-k|}S_{j+k}\prod_{m=1}^{\min(j,k)-1}S^2_{|j-k|+2m}. \tag{S2}$$

In the *thermodynamic limit* ($L\to\infty$, $M\to\infty$, keeping M/L fixed) the solutions (rapidities) v_j, $j=1,2,\ldots M$ (referred to as the Bethe roots) in the complex plane organize in a special way and permit to partition the entire spectrum in terms of particles. A central feature of generic integrable models is the formation of *bounds states*, representing stable particles which exhibit elastic scattering without particle production. In terms of solutions v_j ($j=1,\ldots,M$) to Eq. (S1), these comprise of rapidities with non-zero imaginary parts which share common real parts. According to the *string hypothesis* [48, 54, 55], the spectra of a thermodynamically large system can be partitioned in terms complex-valued solutions, which physically represent multi-magnonic excitations called the strings. A k-string solution ($k\in\mathbb{N}$) centred at $v^k_\alpha\in\mathbb{R}$ is parameterized as

$$\big\{v^{k,i}_\alpha\big\}=\big\{v^k_\alpha+(k+1-2i)\tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2}:i=1,2,\ldots k\big\}, \tag{S3}$$

suppressing exponentially small deviations in system size L.

In the $L\to\infty$, strings approach each other and eventually form a condensate on the real axis in the complex rapidity plane. This allows to introduce distributions of Bethe j-strings ρ_j and their hole counterparts $\bar\rho_j$ (unoccupied solutions allowed by Bethe quantization condition). In the thermodynamic limit the quantization condition (S1) gets replaced by linear integral equations which are customary called the Bethe–Yang equations [48, 53, 54],

$$\rho_j+\bar\rho_j=a_j-a_{j,k}\star\rho_k, \tag{S4}$$

where here and below we assume summation convention over repeated indices, and introduce convolution operation, $(f\star g)(v)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\mathrm{d}t f(v-t)g(t)$. The integral kernels a_j and $a_{j,k}$ represent the 'kinematic data', i.e. encode full scattering data among all distinct types of strings. Specifically, they are the derivatives of scattering phase shifts,

$$a_j(v)=\frac{1}{2\pi\mathrm{i}}\partial_v\log S_j(v),\quad a_{j,k}(v)=\frac{1}{2\pi\mathrm{i}}\partial_v\log S_{j,k}(v). \tag{S5}$$

LOCAL CHARGES AND THERMODYNAMIC SPECTRA

In accordance with the standard practice in Yang–Baxter integrable models [45, 46], we introduce an infinite set of quantum transfer operators,

$$\hat T_j(v)=\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathcal{V}_j}\hat L^{(1)}_j(v)\hat L^{(2)}_j(v)\cdots\hat L^{(L)}_j(v), \tag{S6}$$

defined as traces over L-fold spatially ordered products of Lax operators $\hat{L}_j^{(i)}(u)$,

$$\hat{L}_j^{(i)}(v) = v\,\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1} + \mathrm{i}\sum_{\alpha=\{x,y,z\}} \hat{\sigma}_i^\alpha \otimes \hat{S}^\alpha, \tag{S7}$$

each acting in a tensor product of an auxiliary space carrying a $(j+1)$-dimensional unitary $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ representation $\mathcal{V}_j$ (with spin-$j/2$ operators $\hat{S}^\alpha$ enclosing the algebraic relations $[\hat{S}^a, \hat{S}^b] = \mathrm{i}\epsilon_{abc}\hat{S}^c$) and a local quantum spin-1/2 space attached to a lattice site i (with the corresponding Pauli spins $\hat{\sigma}_i^\alpha$).

Conserved operators $\hat{T}_j$ mutually commute, $[\hat{T}_j(v), \hat{T}_{j'}(v')] = 0$ (for all values of $j, j' \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v' \in \mathbb{C}$), as implied by the Yang–Baxter relation. The set of local charges is then defined through logarithmic derivatives [49, 51],

$$\hat{X}_j(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi\mathrm{i}}\partial_v \log \frac{\hat{T}_j^+(v)}{\phi^{[+j]}(v)}, \tag{S8}$$

where $\phi = T_0^+$ and the spectral parameter v should be restricted to the *physical strip* $\mathcal{P}$, defined as the strip

$$\mathcal{P} = \{v \in \mathbb{C} : |\mathrm{Im}(v)| < \tfrac{1}{2}\}. \tag{S9}$$

For values of v outside of $\mathcal{P}$ the conserved operators $\hat{X}_j(v)$ are not local [23]. The Heisenberg spin chain Hamiltonian H is proportional to the charge $\hat{X}_1(0)$. By convention we adopt $\hat{H} \equiv \hat{X}_1(0)$.

The action of $\hat{X}_j$ on Bethe eigenstates in the $L \to \infty$ limit has been obtained in refs. [50, 51]. Expressed in terms of Bethe root densities ρ_j they take the compact form

$$X_j = G_{j,k} \star \rho_k, \tag{S10}$$

with

$$G_{j,k} = \sum_{m=1}^{\min(j,k)} a_{|j-k|-1+2m}. \tag{S11}$$

Our aim is now to find the inverse of relation (S10), requiring to find an operator $\Box$ such that $(\Box G_{j,k})(v) = \delta_{j,k}\delta(v)$. To this end we employ kernel identities [48]

$$a_j - I_{j,k}\, s \star a_k = s\;\delta_{j,1}, \tag{S12}$$

where the convolution kernel reads,

$$s(v) = \frac{1}{2\cosh(\pi v)}, \tag{S13}$$

and the incidence matrix $I_{j,k} \equiv \delta_{j,k-1} + \delta_{j,k-1}$ expresses how distinct types of particles interact with each other. As Eq. (S12), special attention has to be paid to the pole structure of a_1. To properly account for the singularity at the boundary of $\mathcal{P}$ we introduce a pseudo-inverse

$$s^{-1} \star f = f^+ + f^-, \tag{S14}$$

where

$$f^\pm(v) \equiv f(v \pm \tfrac{\mathrm{i}}{2} \mp \mathrm{i}0^+), \tag{S15}$$

for some positive infinitesimal 0^+. It has to be stressed that s^{-1} is only a left inverse of s, $s^{-1} \star (s \star f) = f$, while in general there exist functions f for which $s \star (s^{-1} \star f) \neq f$. This means that s^{-1} has a non-trivial null space [59, 60]. With aid of the pseudo-inverse we define a discrete d'Alembertian $\Box$, defined on a set of functions f_j as

$$\Box f_j = s^{-1} \star f_j - I_{j,k} f_k \equiv f^+ + f^- - f_{j-1} - f_{j+1}. \tag{S16}$$

The action of $\Box$ on the scattering kernels gives

$$\Box a_j = \delta_{j,1}\delta, \qquad \Box a_{j,k} = I_{j,k}\delta. \tag{S17}$$

It is now clear from definition (S11) that $G_{j,k}$ represents the Green's function of $\Box$,

$$\Box G_{j,k} = \delta_{j,k}\delta. \tag{S18}$$

Relation (S10) can now be readily inverted by applying $\Box$ on both sides, yielding

$$\rho_j = \Box X_j. \tag{S19}$$

The distributions of holes $\bar{\rho}_j$ can be obtained from Bethe–Yang equations (S4) and read

$$\bar{\rho}_j = a_j - s^{-1} \star X_j. \tag{S20}$$

Before proceeding we wish emphasize that the identification (S19) capture two vital ingredients for a proper formulation of complete set of equilibrium ensembles, that is (i) the importance of the physical strip $\mathcal{P}$ and (ii) the role of the regulator in the definition (S15).

CANONICAL AND LOCAL FORM OF TBA EQUATIONS

We now turn our attention to the statistical ensemble

$$\hat{\varrho} = \exp\Big[-\sum_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}v\, \mu_j(v)\hat{\rho}_j(v)\Big]. \tag{S21}$$

A standard approach to perform thermodynamic considerations is to work under the string hypothesis and introduce a discrete set of Y-functions,

$$Y_j = \frac{\bar{\rho}_j}{\rho_j}, \tag{S22}$$

given as ratios of hole and particle densities for each string species. In the thermodynamic limit (by accounting for the Yang–Yang entropy as described in the text) a functional representation for the partition sum $\mathcal{Z} = \mathrm{Tr}\,\hat{\rho}$ yields an infinite set of coupled non-linear integral equations

$$\log Y_j = \mu_j + a_{j,k} \star \log(1 + Y_k^{-1}). \tag{S23}$$

Introducing the inverse of the matrix kernel $(a+1)$, defined via

$$(a+1)^{-1}_{j,k} \star f_k = f_j - I_{j,k} s \star f_k, \tag{S24}$$

enables to disentangle equations (S23) into a locally-coupled form

$$\log Y_j = d_j + I_{j,k} s \star \log(1 + Y_k), \tag{S25}$$

referred to as the local TBA equations. The source terms d_j are related to the chemical potentials

$$d_j = \mu_j - I_{j,k} s \star \mu_k, \tag{S26}$$
$$\mu_j = (a+1)_{j,k} \star d_k, \tag{S27}$$

Modified Y-system

Equations (S25) represent a set of coupled non-linear integral equations defined on the real line. Equivalently, these can be analytically continued in the complex rapidity plane, resulting in an algebraic form a set of functional relations

$$Y_j^+ Y_j^- = e^{\lambda_j}(1 + Y_{j-1})(1 + Y_{j+1}), \tag{S28}$$

which we refer to as the *modified* Y-system. Which shall now exhibit the equivalence between Eq. (S28) and TBA equations (S25).

Since Y-functions of generic equilibrium states are meromorphic functions inside the physical strip $\mathcal{P}$, a naïve 'integration' of the (modified) Y-system Eq. (S28) into TBA equation by virtue of Cauchy theorem is not possible. Nevertheless, singular parts of $\log Y_j$ can be easily remedied. Let us suppose that Y-functions Y_j posses a set of zeros and poles in $\mathcal{P}$, located at $\{\xi^{\rm z}_{j,a}\}$ and $\{\xi^{\rm p}_{j,b}\}$, respectively, with the large-v asymptotics $Y_j^{(\infty)}$. Using functions

$$t(v;\xi) = \tanh\left(\tfrac{\pi}{2}(v-\xi)\right), \quad \mathrm{Im}(\xi) < \tfrac{1}{2}, \tag{S29}$$

which satisfy the property $t^+t^- = 1$, we introduce a set of renormalized Y-functions $\widetilde{Y}_j(v)$,

$$\widetilde{Y}_j(v) = \frac{Y_j(v)}{Y_j^{(\infty)}} \frac{\prod_b t(v;\xi_b^{j,\rm p})}{\prod_a t(v;\xi_a^{j,\rm z})}, \tag{S30}$$

which still satisfy the same same modified Y-system (S28) but are now analytic in $\mathcal{P}$ and have asymptotic behaviour $\lim_{|v|\to\infty} \widetilde{Y}_j(v) = 1$. Now convolving with s after taking the logarithm gives back the local TBA equations,

$$\log Y_j = d_j^{\emptyset} + s \star \lambda_j + I_{j,k} s \star \log(1+Y_k), \tag{S31}$$

where we introduced the splitting of the source terms $d_j = s \star \lambda_j + d_j^{\emptyset}$, with the singular part

$$d_j^{\emptyset} = \sum_a \log t(v;\xi_a^{j,\rm z}) - \sum_b \log t(v;\xi_b^{j,\rm p}). \tag{S32}$$

It is worthwhile remarking that the physical solutions correspond to real-valued $Y_j(v)$ on the real axis, requiring the singularities ξ to always appear in complex-conjugated pairs.

Going in the opposite direction, i.e. transforming Eq. (S31) is straightforwardly obtained by applying s^{-1} to both sides and subsequently taking the exponent. In the process the information from the singular part $d_j^{\emptyset}$ gets transferred into the analytic structure of Y-functions, while λ_j enter the modified Y-system (S28) as the non-universal (i.e. node-dependent) part. Notice that setting $\lambda_j \equiv 0$ recovers the universal form which is common in the literature, governing states whose physical input (TBA source terms) consist solely from the null space components.

Gibbs equilibrium. The cleanest examples of a state which fulfils the modified set of functional relations (S28) is the canonical Gibbs equilibrium, corresponding to bare dispersions $\mu_j^{\rm Gibbs} = \beta\, a_j$. Due to absence of zero modes this is equivalent to have $\lambda_j^{\rm Gibbs} = \mu_j^{\rm Gibbs}$, with $\lambda_j(v) = \beta\, \delta_{j,1}\delta(v)$, restoring the well-known TBA source term $d_j^{\rm Gibbs} = s \star \lambda_j^{\rm Gibbs} = \beta\, s$.

EXACT SOLUTIONS OF QUANTUM QUENCHES

Below we explain how to detect zero modes given a macrostate ρ_j^{Ψ}. In the context of a quench protocol ρ_j^{Ψ} can be understood as equilibrium states of a quench with the initial condition $|\Psi\rangle$. We first consider two simple product states which have represented toy examples in previous studies of quantum quenches in the Heisenberg model [39, 43, 44, 50, 51, 62–64].

Dimer state. We first consider the so-called dimer state

$$|\mathrm{D}\rangle = \frac{1}{2^{L/2}} \left(|{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle - |{\downarrow\uparrow}\rangle\right)^{\otimes L/2}. \tag{S33}$$

The associated macrostate $\rho_j^{\rm D}$ expressed in terms of Y-functions reads [50]

$$Y_j(v) = \frac{j(j+2)v^2}{(v+(j+1)\frac{\rm i}{2})(v-(j+1)\frac{\rm i}{2})}. \tag{S34}$$

These can be quickly verified to obey the standard form of Y-system relations [58, 75, 76]

$$Y_j^+ Y_j^- = (1+Y_{j-1})(1+Y_{j+1}), \tag{S35}$$

representing a specialization of Eq. (S28) when $\lambda_j \equiv 0$. These relations have a purely group-theoretic origin and represent the kinematic input to the problem. The physical input of the solution is encoded in analytic properties

of $Y_j^{\rm D}$ in the complex plane. In the present case consists of a double zero at the origin $v=0$ and a pair of simple poles at $\pm(j+1)\frac{\rm i}{2}$, while the large-v asymptotics matches that of the infinite-temperature Gibbs equilibrium, that is $Y_j(v)\sim j(j+2)$ as $|v|\to\infty$. The only physically relevant input lies inside the strip $\mathcal{P}$, where we find for every function Y_j a double zeros at the origin, yielding the local TBA source terms

$$d_j(v)=\log t(v;0)^2. \tag{S36}$$

The TBA source terms obey the fusion property, $\Box g_j=0$, where

$$g_1(v)=\log\left(4v^2(v+\tfrac{\rm i}{2})(v-\tfrac{\rm i}{2})\right). \tag{S37}$$

Néel state. The antiferromagnetic (Néel) state

$$|{\rm N}\rangle=|{\uparrow\downarrow}\rangle^{\otimes L/2}, \tag{S38}$$

represents another particularly simple example which can be treated exactly (see e.g. [43, 62]). The initial two Y-functions read explicitly [50]

$$Y_1(v)=\frac{4v^2(12v^2+19)}{(v+\frac{\rm i}{2})(v-\frac{\rm i}{2})(v+{\rm i})(v-{\rm i})}, \tag{S39}$$

$$Y_2(v)=\frac{(v+\frac{\rm i}{2})(v-\frac{\rm i}{2})(2v^4+7v^2+2)}{v^2(v+{\rm i})(v-{\rm i})(v+\frac{3{\rm i}}{2})(v-\frac{3{\rm i}}{2})}, \tag{S40}$$

whereas the higher ones can be computed from the Y-system relations (S35). Importantly, the analytic data of Y_j inside $\mathcal{P}$ are now given by double zeros [poles] for index j being odd [even]. This implies

$$\mu_1(v)=\log\left(\frac{16v^2}{(v+\frac{\rm i}{2})(v-\frac{\rm i}{2})}\right), \tag{S41}$$

while the higher source terms follow from the fusion condition,

$$\mu_j=\sum_{k=1}^{j}\mu_1^{[j+1-2k]}. \tag{S42}$$

It is worth stressing that the two examples given here in fact represent atypical initial conditions. This is attributed to the fact that the TBA source have only components from $d_j^{\emptyset}$, implying $\lambda_j\equiv 0$. General initial states $|\Psi\rangle$ on the other hand involve non-vanishing λ_j or, put differently, are given by functions μ_j which does violate the fusion condition (S42). A practical drawback of this is that a full specification of a macrostate ρ_j goes beyond the knowledge of only μ_1.

Generic states. Here we analyse a non-trivial periodic state of 2-spin ferromagnetic domain walls,

$$|\Phi\rangle=|{\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow}\rangle^{\otimes L/4}, \tag{S43}$$

representing one of the simplest generic initial states. This state has already appeared in previous studies of quantum quench applications as the initial condition in refs. [39, 77]. Expressions for the first few Y-functions can computed analytically, but are already rather formidable. The initial Y-function for instance reads

$$Y_1(v)=\frac{\left(64v^6+112v^4-20v^2+5\right)\left(192v^6+784v^4+1124v^2+491\right)}{\left(4v^2+1\right)\left(4v^2+5\right)\left(256v^8+1024v^6+1696v^4+1248v^2+29\right)}, \tag{S44}$$

with four zeros at $\pm(0.382\pm 0.234\,{\rm i})$ and two poles at $\pm 0.155\,{\rm i}$, in $\mathcal{P}$. It can furthermore be easily verified analytically that the universal form of the Y-system (S35) is now no longer satisfied (see also [77]). This specifically means that after subtracting the singular components $d_j^{\emptyset}$ from the TBA source terms d_j, we are left with non-vanishing components $s\star\lambda_j$ which in turn determine the node-dependent terms λ_j in the modified Y-system relations (S28).

QUENCH ACTION

The Quench Action approach [41] (see [74] for a review) has been introduced as a functional integral approach towards time-evolution of local observables in thermodynamically large integrable many-body systems. The steady-state limit of the evolution is entirely determined from the stationary part of the Quench Action functional

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{QA}} = \int \mathcal{D}[\rho_j] \exp\Big(- L \sum_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}v (\mu_j(v) + \mathfrak{s}_j(v))\Big), \tag{S45}$$

where the state-dependent terms μ_j represent the mode decomposition of the (density of the) logarithmic overlap between $|\Psi\rangle$ and a general macrostate, namely

$$\sum_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{d}v\, \mu_j(v)\rho_j(v) \equiv \lim_{L\to\infty} L^{-1} \log |\langle \Psi | \{v_j\}\rangle|^2. \tag{S46}$$

Saddle-point evaluation of the functional $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{QA}}$ yields a sought-for macrostate ρ_j. As the choice of notation already suggests, μ_j of Eq. (S46) are nothing but the chemical potentials corresponding to individual particle modes. This can be most easily be seen by comparing Eq. (S46) with the form of Eq. (S21).